

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/319,490 10/07/94 ESCH

H 21633593200F

EXAMINER

HENDRICKSON, S

11M1/0317

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

CUSHMAN DARBY & CUSHMAN
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE NW
NINTH FLOOR EAST TOWER
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3918

1103

DATE MAILED:

03/17/95

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS*for purposes of restriction* This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 2/16/95 This action is made final.A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____ month(s), 30 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133**Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:**

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION1. Claims 1-6 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.3. Claims _____ are allowed.4. Claims _____ are rejected.5. Claims _____ are objected to.6. Claims 1-6 are subject to restriction or election requirement.7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.14. Other**EXAMINER'S ACTION**

Art Unit: 1103

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

I. Claim 1, drawn to silica, classified in Class 423, subclass 335.

II. Claims 2-4, drawn to a process for making silica, classified in Class 423, subclass 339.

III. Claims 5 and 6, drawn to a composition of rubber and silica, classified in Class 524, subclass 492.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product as claimed may be made by the materially different process of calcination of an organosilicon compound; note that the product can be other than the one made by the process of Group II.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially

Art Unit: 1103

different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product has materially different use such as a catalyst support or dessicant.

Groups II and III are not related and are distinct since Group III can use a silica made by a materially different process and the process of Group II does not require any particular use of the silica.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different subject matter and classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Mr. Wiseman on 3/13/95 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (703) 308-2539.

S. Hendrickson
3/14/95

Michael L Lewis
Michael Lewis
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Patent Examining Group 110